

Separability in $2 \times N$ composite quantum systems

B. Kraus¹, J. I. Cirac¹, S. Karnas², and M. Lewenstein²

¹*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Innsbruck, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria*

²*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Hannover, D-30163 Hannover, Germany*

(February 1, 2008)

We analyze the separability properties of density operators supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ whose partial transposes are positive operators. We show that if the rank of ρ equals N then it is separable, and that bound entangled states have rank larger than N . We also give a separability criterion for a generic density operator such that the sum of its rank and the one of its partial transpose does not exceed $3N$. If it exceeds this number we show that one can subtract product vectors until decreasing it to $3N$, while keeping the positivity of ρ and its partial transpose. This automatically gives us a sufficient criterion for separability for general density operators. We also prove that all density operators that remain invariant after partial transposition with respect to the first system are separable.

I. INTRODUCTION

Perhaps, entanglement is the most intriguing property of Quantum Mechanics. It arises when two or more systems are in a non-separable state; that is, in a state that cannot be prepared locally [1]. Apart from having fundamental implications [2], such as Bell's theorem or the existence of decoherence, entanglement is in the realm of several practical applications of Quantum Information [3].

Despite of its importance, we do not know yet how to quantify entanglement. In fact, even in the simple case in which we only have two systems A and B in a mixed state ρ , there exists no general criterion that allows us to distinguish whether the state is separable or not; that is, whether it can be written as a mixture of product vectors of the form $|e, f\rangle \equiv |e\rangle_A \otimes |f\rangle_B$. Several necessary conditions for separability have been formulated in the recent years. Werner [1] formulated a criterion based on the analysis of a local hidden variable model and on the positivity of the mean value of the flipping operator. The Horodeckis [4] obtained a criterium in the form of inequalities for the so called α -entropies. An important step forward to clarify the situation was taken by Peres [5]. Peres criterion is based on the positivity of the operator obtained after partially transposing the density operator. This criterion gives a *necessary condition* for separability for density operators in Hilbert spaces of arbitrary dimension: if the partial transpose of a given density operator ρ is not positive, then ρ is not separable.

The Horodecki family [6] has established the connection between separability and the theory of positive op-

erator maps [7]. A necessary and sufficient condition for separability has been expressed in terms of these maps; such condition, unfortunately, is constructive only if the structure of the set of positive maps is sufficiently known. This turns out to be the case for the situations in which the Hilbert space corresponding to the first subsystem is two-dimensional and the one of the second is either two- or three-dimensional, the so-called 2×2 (two qubits) and 2×3 cases (one qubit and one qutrit), respectively. Using that result, the Horodeckis have shown that Peres criterion (called hereafter Peres-Horodecki criterion) provides a sufficient condition for separability in 2×2 and 2×3 systems. The fact that this is not a sufficient condition for higher dimensional systems was pointed out later on [8], by giving examples of density matrices in 2×4 and 3×3 spaces that are entangled, but have positive partial transposes (PPT). After that, a systematic method of constructing entangled states with PPT, based on the existence of unextendible basis of product vectors was formulated [9,10]. Recently, positive map theory has been used to obtain a reduction criterion of separability [11].

So far, there have been very few results concerning *sufficient conditions* for separability in high dimensional systems [12,13]. In this paper we analyze the separability properties of density operators acting on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$. This situation is particularly useful since it allows to determine a number of separability properties in the multiqubit case [14]. Our analysis is based on subtracting product vectors from ρ while keeping ρ and its partial transpose positive. The idea of subtracting product vectors was developed in [15] and has proven to be very useful so far since it allowed: i) to define unique optimal decomposition of mixed states in Hilbert space of arbitrary dimensions into a sum of separable and inseparable part; ii) to find minimal decompositions into product vectors of separable density operators acting on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2$ (two qubits), and iii) to define a measure of entanglement in those systems. In the present paper, by studying the conditions under which we can subtract such product vectors we are able to find necessary and sufficient conditions for separability for low and medium rank density operators. We also give a sufficient condition for separability for general density operators. Furthermore, we show that when quantum systems remain invariant after partial transposition with respect to the first system then they are separable. This last result displays the difference between the $2 \times N$ case and the general $M \times N$ one ($N, M > 2$), where it has been found that there are op-

erators satisfying this condition which are not separable [9].

The structure of this paper is the following: In Section II we give the definitions that we use throughout the paper. In Section III we derive a series of lemmas concerning product vectors. First, we recover the results given in Ref. [15] concerning the conditions under which one can subtract product vectors from a density operator. We then give a separability criterion for the case in which there is a finite set of product vectors that can be subtracted. Next we show that if there are product vectors in the kernel of ρ , then the problem of separability can be highly simplified. Finally, we analyze under which conditions there exist product vectors in subspaces (e.g. the kernel and the range of ρ), and show that the problem reduces to finding the roots of complex polynomials. Section IV contains most of the results of this work concerning separability. We first show that one just have to consider the cases in which the rank of ρ is larger or equal than N . When the rank of ρ is equal to N (and ρ is not trivially supported on a smaller subsystem of B) then it is separable. From this result follows that bound entangled states have a rank larger than N . We continue by analyzing the case in which the sum of the ranks of ρ and its partial transpose is smaller than $3N$, giving a necessary and sufficient separability criterion for generic density operators and for $N \leq 10$. After that, we show how in the general case one can reduce the problem to that situation. Then, we prove that if ρ is equal to its partial transpose with respect to the first subsystem, then it is separable. The same statement holds when ρ is “sufficiently close” to its partial transpose (in the sense of operator norm, for instance). Finally, in Section V we illustrate our results by analyzing the case $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$.

II. SEPARABILITY IN $2 \times N$

We consider a density operator $\rho \geq 0$ acting on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$. We wish to find out conditions such that we can state whether ρ is separable or not; that is, whether it can be written as

$$\rho = \sum_i |e_i, f_i\rangle\langle e_i, f_i|, \quad (1)$$

where $|e_i, f_i\rangle \equiv |e_i\rangle_A \otimes |f_i\rangle_B$ are unnormalized product states. Throughout this paper we will make use of the fact that a necessary condition for separability is that the partial transposition of ρ is a positive operator [5]. Given an orthonormal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\} \in \mathcal{C}^2$, we define the partial transposition of ρ with respect to the first system in that basis as

$$\rho^{TA} = \sum_{i,j=0}^1 A\langle i|\rho|j\rangle_A |j\rangle_A \langle i| \quad (2)$$

Thus, from now on we will assume that both $\rho, \rho^{TA} \geq 0$ (otherwise ρ is already not separable).

Throughout this paper $K(X)$, $R(X)$, $k(X)$, and $r(X)$ denote the kernel, range, dimension of the kernel, and rank of the operator X , respectively. By $|e^*\rangle$ we will denote the complex conjugated vector of $|e\rangle$ in the basis $|0\rangle_A, |1\rangle_A$ in which we perform the partial transposition; that is, if $|e\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ then $|e^*\rangle = \alpha^*|0\rangle + \beta^*|1\rangle$. The subscript “ r ” will be used to denote real vectors; that is $|e_r\rangle = |e_r^*\rangle$. We will denote by $|\hat{e}\rangle$ the vector which is orthogonal to $|e\rangle$. On the other hand, we will make use of the following property,

$${}_A\langle e_i|\rho|e_j\rangle_A = {}_A\langle e_i^*|\rho^{TA}|e_j^*\rangle_A \quad (3)$$

for any pair $|e_i\rangle, |e_j\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^2$, which can be easily deduced from the definition of partial transposition. Note that if ρ is separable [cf (1)], then

$$\rho^{TA} = \sum_i |e_i^*, f_i\rangle\langle e_i^*, f_i|, \quad (4)$$

is also separable; obviously, the opposite is also true.

We say that ρ acting on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ is supported in $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^M$ if the minimal subspace $H \subseteq \mathcal{C}^N$ such that $R(\rho) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes H$ has dimension M . This means that there exist $N - M$ (and not more) linearly independent vectors $\{|f_i\rangle, i = 1, 2, \dots, N - M\} \in \mathcal{C}^N$ such that $|e, f_i\rangle \in K(\rho)$ for all $|e\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^2$. The utility of this definition can be seen in the following example. Let us consider an operator ρ acting on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2$. We can always trivially regard this operator as acting on a higher dimensional space (e.g., $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$) but giving zero whenever it acts outside the original space. If we are studying the separability properties of ρ it is useful to get rid of the spurious dimensions and really consider ρ as acting on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2$. Thus, we will concentrate on operators not only acting, but also supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$.

The method we use to find separability conditions is based on subtracting product vectors from ρ in such a way that both ρ and ρ^{TA} remain positive. If we are able to subtract several of those product vectors until we achieve that the result vanishes, then we will have obtained that ρ is separable. Thus, a crucial point is to find the conditions under which we can find such product vectors. In the next few sections we will determine those conditions.

III. PRODUCT VECTORS

As mentioned above, our procedure to study separability is based on subtracting product vectors $|e, f\rangle$ from the density operator ρ in such a way that the resulting operator and its partial transpose remain positive. Thus, we have to determine under which conditions this is possible. This section deals with that problem. We have

divided it in three parts: (i) Properties related to the existence of product vectors in the range of ρ or ρ^{TA} ; (ii) Properties related to the existence of product vectors in the kernel of ρ or ρ^{TA} ; (iii) Existence of product vectors in subspaces. In the first subsection we derive some useful properties of a density operator whenever there are product vectors in its range. In particular, we will recover the results of Ref. [15] which state that we can only subtract product vectors of ρ that belong to its range, and that by subtracting the right amount we can always decrease its rank. Then we will show that if we have a set of product vectors in the range of ρ and another related set in the range of ρ^{TA} , then ρ is separable iff it can be written as a mixture of those vectors. This means that if we can find all the product vectors satisfying these conditions, then we can check whether ρ is separable or not by using only those vectors. In the second subsection we will derive some other properties of ρ whenever there are product vectors in its kernel. In particular we will show that in that case one can subtract one product vector and not only reduce the rank of ρ , but also reduce the problem to finding whether a related density operator supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \times \mathcal{C}^{N-1}$ is separable. This means that the product vectors in the kernel play a very important role since they allow to simplify the problem of separability. Finally, in the last subsection we will derive the conditions needed to have product vectors in subspaces; in particular in the kernel and the range of ρ and ρ^{TA} . We will see that in order to find them, one has to solve some complex polynomial equations. The solutions to those equations determine which are the product vectors that can be subtracted from ρ , which, together with the results of the first subsection, allow us to analyze the separability of certain density operators, as it will be shown in the next section.

A. Range of ρ

We have divided this subsection in two: In the first one we introduce a lemma which gives the conditions under which the difference of two positive operators is a positive operator itself. This allows us to recover in a simple way the results given in [15] regarding subtracting product vectors from ρ . In the second one we show that the set of (common) product vectors in the ranges of ρ and ρ^{TA} suffices to study the separability properties of ρ .

1. Subtracting product vectors

We use the operator norm, namely $\|A\| = \max_{\|\phi\|=1} \|A|\phi\rangle\|$. For a given hermitian operator X we will denote by X^{-1} its pseudoinverse; that is, if the spectral decomposition of $X = \sum_k X_k |x_k\rangle\langle x_k|$ with $X_k \neq 0$, then $X^{-1} = \sum_k X_k^{-1} |x_k\rangle\langle x_k|$.

Lemma 1: Given two hermitian operators $X, Y \geq 0$ then $X - Y \geq 0$ iff $K(X) \subseteq K(Y)$ and $\|Y^{\frac{1}{2}}X^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \leq 1$.

Proof: (if) We can write an arbitrary vector $|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi^r\rangle + |\Psi^k\rangle$, where $|\Psi^r\rangle \in R(X)$ and $|\Psi^k\rangle \in K(X) \subseteq K(Y)$. Therefore $\langle\Psi|X - Y|\Psi\rangle = \langle\Psi^r|X - Y|\Psi^r\rangle$. Since $|\Psi^r\rangle \in R(X) = R(X^{1/2})$ we have that there exists some $|\Phi\rangle \in R(X^{1/2})$ such that $|\Psi^r\rangle = X^{-1/2}|\Phi\rangle$. Using that

$$\langle\Phi|X^{-1/2}YX^{-1/2}|\Phi\rangle \leq \langle\Phi|\Phi\rangle, \quad (5)$$

we obtain that $\langle\Psi^r|X - Y|\Psi^r\rangle \geq 0$, and thus $X - Y \geq 0$. (only if) First, $K(X) \subseteq K(Y)$ since otherwise there would be a vector $|\Psi\rangle \in K(X)$ for which $\langle\Psi|Y|\Psi\rangle > 0$, and therefore $\langle\Psi|X - Y|\Psi\rangle < 0$. Moreover, $\forall |\Psi^r\rangle \in R(X)$ we can find $|\Phi\rangle \in R(X^{1/2})$ such that $|\Psi^r\rangle = X^{1/2}|\Phi\rangle$. Using that $\langle\Phi|X|\Phi\rangle \geq \langle\Phi|Y|\Phi\rangle$ we obtain that

$$1 \geq \langle\Psi^r|X^{-1/2}YX^{-1/2}|\Psi^r\rangle / \langle\Psi^r|\Psi^r\rangle, \quad (6)$$

which immediately gives $\|Y^{\frac{1}{2}}X^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \leq 1$.

We can use this lemma to recover the results of Ref. [15]. Given an operator ρ , a product vector $|e, f\rangle$ and $\lambda > 0$, we define

$$\tilde{\rho} \equiv \rho - \lambda |e, f\rangle\langle e, f|, \quad (7a)$$

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{\langle e, f | \rho^{-1} | e, f \rangle}, \quad (7b)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_0 = \frac{1}{\langle e^*, f | (\rho^{TA})^{-1} | e^*, f \rangle}. \quad (7c)$$

We then have

Corollary 1: $\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\rho}^{TA} \geq 0$ iff $|e, f\rangle \in R(\rho)$, $|e^*, f\rangle \in R(\rho^{TA})$ and $\lambda \leq \min(\lambda_0, \bar{\lambda}_0)$.

Proof: We can simply use Lemma 1 with $X = \rho$ and $Y = \lambda |e, f\rangle\langle e, f|$, and with $X = \rho^{TA}$ and $Y = \lambda |e^*, f\rangle\langle e^*, f|$. $\square$

The most interesting situation occurs when we choose $\lambda = \min(\lambda_0, \bar{\lambda}_0)$, since in that case we can reduce the ranks of ρ and/or ρ^{TA} , as states the following

Lemma 2: Let $|e, f\rangle \in R(\rho)$, $|e^*, f\rangle \in R(\rho^{TA})$. Then

- (i) If $\lambda = \lambda_0 < \bar{\lambda}_0$ then $r(\tilde{\rho}) = r(\rho) - 1$ and $r(\tilde{\rho}^{TA}) = r(\rho^{TA})$.
- (ii) If $\lambda = \bar{\lambda}_0 < \lambda_0$ then $r(\tilde{\rho}) = r(\rho)$ and $r(\tilde{\rho}^{TA}) = r(\rho^{TA}) - 1$.
- (iii) If $\lambda = \bar{\lambda}_0 = \lambda_0$ then $r(\tilde{\rho}) = r(\rho) - 1$ and $r(\tilde{\rho}^{TA}) = r(\rho^{TA}) - 1$.

Proof: Here, we just prove (i), since for the other two cases one can follow the same arguments. First, note that $r(\tilde{\rho}) \geq r(\rho) - 1$ since they differ only by one one-dimensional projector. On the other hand, $K(\rho) \subseteq K(\tilde{\rho})$ for if $|\Psi\rangle \in K(\rho)$ then $\tilde{\rho}|\Psi\rangle = -\lambda_0 \langle e, f | \Psi \rangle = 0$ since $|e, f\rangle \in R(\rho) \perp K(\rho)$. Besides, the vector $\rho^{-1}|e, f\rangle$ is not in $K(\rho)$ but it is indeed in $K(\tilde{\rho})$, which can be checked by substitution in Eq. (7a). $\square$

This lemma allows us to decrease either the rank of ρ , of its partial transpose, or of both of them by subtracting a product vector $|e, f\rangle$ which belongs to $R(\rho)$ and such that $|e^*, f\rangle$ is in $R(\rho^{TA})$.

2. Separability and product vectors

Let us denote by $\{|e_i, f_i\rangle, i = 1, 2, \dots, L\}$ the product vectors such that $|e_i, f_i\rangle \in R(\rho)$ and $|e_i^*, f_i\rangle \in R(\rho^{TA})$. Note that we assume here that the total number of such vectors L is finite. We also denote by $P_i \equiv |e_i, f_i\rangle\langle e_i, f_i|$. We have

Lemma 3: ρ is separable iff it can be written as a convex combination of P_i .

Proof: (if) Use the definition of separable state; (only if) We just have to notice that if a positive operator ρ can be written as a convex combination of certain projectors on the vectors $|\Psi_i\rangle$, then these vectors must belong to its range. Otherwise, there would exist a certain vector $|\Psi_{i_0}\rangle = |\Psi_{i_0}^r\rangle + |\Psi_{i_0}^k\rangle$, where $|\Psi_{i_0}^r\rangle \in R(\rho)$ and $0 \neq |\Psi_{i_0}^k\rangle \in K(\rho)$, so that $\langle \Psi_{i_0}^k | \rho | \Psi_{i_0}^k \rangle > 0$, which contradicts the fact that $|\Psi_{i_0}^k\rangle \in K(\rho)$. Thus, if ρ is separable then it can be written as a convex combination of projectors on product vectors $|e_i, f_i\rangle \in R(\rho)$. Also ρ^{TA} can be written as the same convex combination, but with $|e_i^*, f_i\rangle \in R(\rho^{TA})$. $\square$

Let the projectors P_i be linearly independent. These projectors belong to the space $\mathcal{L}[R(\rho)]$ of linear operators acting on $R(\rho)$, which has dimension $r(\rho)^2$. On the other hand, the projectors P_i^{TA} will be linearly independent as well, since partial transposition is a linear invertible map. These projectors belong to the space $\mathcal{L}[R(\rho^{TA})]$, which has dimension $r(\rho^{TA})^2$. Therefore, if the P_i are linearly independent we must have $L \leq \min[r(\rho)^2, r(\rho^{TA})^2]$. We can always complete the set P_i with other operators P_i ($i = L+1, \dots, r(\rho)^2$) to form a basis in $\mathcal{L}[R(\rho)]$. That is a Hilbert space with the scalar product $(A, B) = \text{tr}(A^\dagger B)$. Thus, we can construct the biorthogonal basis to $\{P_i\}$ in $\mathcal{L}[R(\rho)]$; that is, we can find a set of operators $Q_i \in \mathcal{L}[R(\rho)]$ such that $\text{tr}(Q_i^\dagger P_j) = \delta_{ij}$. Then we have the following necessary and sufficient separability condition

Lemma 4: If P_i are linearly independent, then ρ is separable iff $\text{tr}(Q_i^\dagger \rho) \geq 0 \forall i \leq L$ and $\text{tr}(Q_i^\dagger \rho) = 0 \forall i > L$.

Proof: Since the P_i form a basis, ρ can be expanded in a unique way as

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{r(\rho)^2} c_i P_i, \quad (8)$$

with $c_i = \text{tr}(Q_i \rho)$. (if) since $c_i \geq 0$ we have that ρ can be written as a convex combination of projectors on $|e_i, f_i\rangle$, i.e. it is separable; (only if) If ρ is separable, according to Lemma 3 it can be written as (8) with $c_i = 0$ if $i > L$ and $c_i \geq 0$ if $i \leq L$. $\square$

This lemma is important since in general, if $L \leq \min[r(\rho)^2, r(\rho^{TA})]$, the projectors will be linearly independent. The reason is that given a set of $L \leq D^2$ random product vectors which span a Hilbert space of dimension D , then the corresponding projectors are linearly independent.

B. Kernel of ρ

We will show that if there is a product vector in the kernel of ρ , then one can find a positive operator acting on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^{N-1}$ which has the same separability properties as ρ . This means that one can reduce the dimensionality of the Hilbert space of the second subsystem, which simplifies the problem. We will use later on these results to prove facts regarding low rank density operators. We start proving a simple

Lemma 5: $|e^*, f\rangle \in K(\rho^{TA})$ iff $|e, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$.

Proof: (if) We have $0 = \langle e, f | \rho | e, f \rangle$. Using (3), we have $0 = \langle e^*, f | \rho^{TA} | e^*, f \rangle$ and since $\rho^{TA} \geq 0$ then $\rho^{TA} | e^*, f \rangle = 0$; (only if) One can prove it in the same way. $\square$

Lemma 6: If $|e, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$ then either:

- (i) $|\hat{e}, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$, or
- (ii) there exists a non-zero $|g\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^N$ such that $\rho|\hat{e}, f\rangle = |\hat{e}, g\rangle$ and $\rho^{TA}|\hat{e}^*, f\rangle = |\hat{e}^*, g\rangle$.

Proof: According to Lemma 5, if $|e, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$ then $|e^*, f\rangle \in K(\rho^{TA})$. Therefore

$$0 = \langle \hat{e}^*, h | \rho^{TA} | e^*, f \rangle = \langle e, h | \rho | \hat{e}, f \rangle, \quad (9)$$

$\forall |h\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^N$. Thus we know that either $\rho|\hat{e}, f\rangle = 0$ or $\rho|\hat{e}, f\rangle = |\hat{e}, g_1\rangle$ for some $|g_1\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^N$. Analogously, since $|e, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$ we have that either $\rho^{TA}|\hat{e}^*, f\rangle = 0$ or $\rho^{TA}|\hat{e}^*, f\rangle = |\hat{e}^*, g_2\rangle$ for some $|g_2\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^N$. In the first case, using Lemma 5 we have (i). For (ii), it remains to be proven that $|g_1\rangle = |g_2\rangle$. Using the orthogonality of $|e\rangle$ and $|\hat{e}\rangle$ we have

$$\| |\hat{e}\rangle \|^2 |g_1\rangle = \langle \hat{e} | \rho | \hat{e}, f \rangle = \langle \hat{e}^* | \rho^{TA} | \hat{e}^*, f \rangle = \| |\hat{e}\rangle \|^2 |g_2\rangle. \quad (10)$$

The first part of this lemma simply states that ρ is supported on a smaller space $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^M$ with $M < N$, since $|e, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$ for all $|e\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^2$. In other words, that we have spurious dimensions in the second subsystem. In the following, we will not consider that trivial case, and therefore we will assume that ρ is supported on the whole space $\mathcal{C}^2 \times \mathcal{C}^N$. In that case, Lemma 6 together with Lemma 2 tell us that there is a vector that can be subtracted from ρ . In fact, this gives rise to one of the most important results of this section:

Lemma 7: If ρ is supported in $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ and there exists a product vector in $K(\rho)$ then $\rho = \tilde{\rho} + \rho_s$, where ρ_s is a projector on a product vector and

- (i) $r(\tilde{\rho}) = r(\rho) - 1$ and $r(\tilde{\rho}^{TA}) = r(\rho^{TA}) - 1$.
- (ii) $\tilde{\rho}$ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^{N-1}$.
- (iii) $\tilde{\rho}$ is separable iff ρ is separable.

Proof: We have that $|e, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$. Using the previous Lemma (ii) (since ρ is supported in $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$) we have that $\rho|\hat{e}, f\rangle = |\hat{e}, g\rangle$ and $\rho^{TA}|\hat{e}^*, f\rangle = |\hat{e}^*, g\rangle$. According to Corollary 1 we can subtract the product vector $|\hat{e}, g\rangle$, obtaining $\tilde{\rho} = \rho - \rho_s$ where $\rho_s = \lambda|\hat{e}, g\rangle\langle\hat{e}, g|$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda = \lambda_0 &= \frac{1}{\langle\hat{e}, g|\rho^{-1}|\hat{e}, g\rangle} = \frac{1}{\|\hat{e}\|^2\langle g|f\rangle} \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle\hat{e}^*, g|(\rho^{TA})^{-1}|\hat{e}^*, g\rangle} = \bar{\lambda}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

According to Lemma 2 (iii) we have decreased the ranks of both ρ and ρ^{TA} by one, which proves (i). We also have that $|\hat{e}, f\rangle, |e, f\rangle \in K(\tilde{\rho})$ and therefore $\tilde{\rho}$ is supported in $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^M$ with $M < N$. Now we show that $M = N - 1$. If it was smaller, then there would exist $|h\rangle$ orthogonal to $|f\rangle$ such that $|e, h\rangle, |\hat{e}, h\rangle \in K(\tilde{\rho})$. In that case we would have $\rho|e, h\rangle = 0$ and $\rho|\hat{e}, h\rangle = c|\hat{e}, g\rangle$ where c is a constant. If we define $|f'\rangle = c|f\rangle - |h\rangle \neq 0$ we would have that $|e, f'\rangle, |\hat{e}, f'\rangle \in K(\rho)$, contrary to our assumption that ρ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$, which proves (ii). It remains to be shown (iii) that ρ is separable iff $\tilde{\rho}$ is too: (if) trivial; (only if) If ρ is separable, and since $\rho|e, f\rangle = 0$ we can always write

$$\rho = \sum |e_i, \hat{f}_i\rangle\langle e_i, \hat{f}_i| + |\hat{e}\rangle\langle\hat{e}| \otimes \eta, \quad (12)$$

where $\langle f|\hat{f}_i\rangle = 0$ and η is a positive operator acting on $\mathcal{C}^N$. If we impose $|\hat{e}, g\rangle = \rho|\hat{e}, f\rangle$ we obtain $|g\rangle = \|\hat{e}\|^2\eta|f\rangle$, and therefore $|g\rangle \in R(\eta)$. We can write

$$\tilde{\rho} = \sum |e_i, \hat{f}_i\rangle\langle e_i, \hat{f}_i| + |\hat{e}\rangle\langle\hat{e}| \otimes (\eta - \lambda_0|g\rangle\langle g|), \quad (13)$$

so that if we show that the operator $(\eta - \lambda_0|g\rangle\langle g|) \geq 0$ then we have that $\tilde{\rho}$ is separable. Using (11) we have that such operator is

$$\eta - \frac{1}{\|\hat{e}\|^2\langle g|f\rangle}|g\rangle\langle g| = \eta - \frac{1}{\langle g|\eta^{-1}|g\rangle}|g\rangle\langle g|, \quad (14)$$

which is positive according to Lemma 1. $\square$

This theorem simply says that when there is a product vector in the kernel of ρ , then we can reduce the problem without changing the separability properties of ρ . Later on we will consider states which are invariant under partial transposition. In that case, we can particularize this result and obtain:

Lemma 8: If in addition to the premises of Lemma 7 $\rho = \rho^{TA}$ then we can always obtain the results of that lemma with $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\rho}^{TA}$.

Proof: We know from Lemma 5 that if there is a product vector $|e, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$ then $|e^*, f\rangle \in K(\rho^{TA}) = K(\rho)$.

With these two vectors we can always construct $|e_r, f\rangle \in K(\rho)$ where $|e_r\rangle$ is real (in the basis in which we take the partial transposition). If we proceed with this vector as in the previous lemma then we obtain the desired result. $\square$

Finally, we will show a property of the vectors contained in $K(\rho)$ for the case when there is no product vector in $K(\rho)$. We will use this property later on to simplify the search of product vectors in $R(\rho)$. Let us denote by $\{|\Psi_i^1\rangle, i = 1 \dots k(\rho)\}$ and $\{|\Psi_i^2\rangle, i = 1 \dots k(\rho^{TA})\}$ a basis in $K(\rho)$ and $K(\rho^{TA})$, respectively. Then we have the following:

Lemma 9: If there exists no product vector in $K(\rho)$ then both $\{\langle e|\Psi_i^1\rangle\}$ and $\{\langle e^*|\Psi_i^2\rangle\}$ are sets of linearly independent vectors in $\mathcal{C}^N$ for any $|e\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^2$.

Proof: We start proving that for any $|e\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^2$, the operator $\langle e|\rho|e\rangle$ is invertible. Otherwise there would exist $|h\rangle \in \mathcal{C}^N$ such that $0 = \langle h|\langle e|\rho|e\rangle|h\rangle$ and since $\rho \geq 0$ then $\rho|\hat{e}, h\rangle = 0$, which contradicts our assumptions. On the other hand, since $\{|e\rangle, |\hat{e}\rangle\}$ is a basis in $\mathcal{C}^2$ we can write the vectors in the kernel of ρ as

$$|\Psi_i^1\rangle = |e, \Psi_i^e\rangle + |\hat{e}, \Psi_i^{\hat{e}}\rangle. \quad (15)$$

Using that they are in the kernel of ρ we find that

$$|\Psi_i^{\hat{e}}\rangle = -\frac{1}{\langle\hat{e}|\rho|\hat{e}\rangle}\langle\hat{e}|\rho|e\rangle|\Psi_i^e\rangle, \quad (16)$$

where we made use of the fact that the operator $\langle\hat{e}|\rho|\hat{e}\rangle$ is invertible. Substituting this expression in (15), we have

$$|\Psi_i^1\rangle = (\mathbf{I} + |\hat{e}\rangle\frac{1}{\langle\hat{e}|\rho|\hat{e}\rangle}\langle\hat{e}|\rho|e\rangle)|e, \Psi_i^e\rangle. \quad (17)$$

Since the $|\Psi_{i_1}^1\rangle$'s are linearly independent, so must be the $|\Psi_{i_1}^e\rangle$'s. The same argumentation holds for the vectors in the kernel of ρ^{TA} . $\square$

C. In Subspaces

As we have shown above, it is important to know when one can be sure that there exists a product vector in either the range or the kernel of a density operator. In this section we will prove that for sufficiently large subspaces there always exist product vectors. We will denote by $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, and $\{|1\rangle, \dots, |N\rangle\}$ orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{C}^2$ and $\mathcal{C}^N$, respectively.

Lemma 10: Any subspace $H \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ with $\dim(H) = M > N$ contains an infinite number of product vectors. If $M = N$ it contains at least one product vector.

Proof: We denote by $\{|\Psi_i\rangle, i = 1, \dots, 2N - M\}$ a basis in the orthogonal complement of H . We have

$$|\Psi_i\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^N [A_{i,k}|0, k\rangle + B_{i,k}|1, k\rangle], \quad (18)$$

where A and B are $(2N - M) \times N$ -matrices. We write the product vector $|e, f\rangle$ as

$$|e, f\rangle = (\alpha|0\rangle_A + |1\rangle_A) \otimes \sum_k f_k |k\rangle_B. \quad (19)$$

Imposing that $|e, f\rangle$ is orthogonal to the $|\Psi_i\rangle$ for all i gives $(\alpha A^* + B^*)\vec{f} = 0$. This can be regarded as an equation for $\vec{f}$. When $M > N$ there exist non trivial solutions for each α , i.e. for each $|e\rangle$. For $M = N$ we have non trivial results provided $\det(\alpha A^* + B^*) = 0$; the determinant is a polynomial of N -th degree in α , which always has roots. $\square$

Corollary 2: Any subspace $H \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ with $\dim(H) = M > N$ contains an infinite number of product vectors of the form $|e_r, f\rangle$, where $|e_r\rangle = |e_r^*\rangle$.

As we have seen in previous subsections, we can subtract vectors from ρ while keeping the positivity of both ρ and ρ^{T_A} provided we can find a product vector $|e, f\rangle \in R(\rho)$ and such that $|e^*, f\rangle \in R(\rho^{T_A})$. We can use the idea given in the proof of the previous lemma to find out under which conditions this is possible. Given any two subspaces $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ with $\dim(H_{1,2}) = M_{1,2}$ we denote by $\{|\Psi_{i,2}^{1,2}\rangle, i_{1,2} = 1, \dots, 2N - M_{1,2}\}$ a basis in the orthogonal complement of $H_{1,2}$, respectively. Then we have

Lemma 11: (i) If $M_1 + M_2 > 3N$ then there exists an infinite number of product vectors $|e, f\rangle \in H_1$ such that $|e^*, f\rangle \in H_2$; (ii) If $M_1 + M_2 \leq 3N$ then there exists a product vector $|e, f\rangle \in H_1$ such that $|e^*, f\rangle \in H_2$ iff we can find an α such that there are at most $N - 1$ linearly independent vectors among the following vectors: $\{\alpha\langle\Psi_{i_1}^1|0\rangle + \langle\Psi_{i_1}^1|1\rangle, \alpha^*\langle\Psi_{i_2}^2|0\rangle + \langle\Psi_{i_2}^2|1\rangle\}$.

Proof: We have

$$|\Psi_{i,2}^{1,2}\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^N [A_{i,k}^{1,2}|0, k\rangle + B_{i,k}^{1,2}|1, k\rangle], \quad (20)$$

where $A^{1,2}$ and $B^{1,2}$ are $(2N - M_{1,2}) \times N$ -matrices. Writing a product vector $|e, f\rangle$ as in (19) and imposing that it is orthogonal to $|\Psi_i^1\rangle$ and $|e^*, f\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\Psi_i^2\rangle$ for all i , we arrive at the following equations:

$$[\alpha(A^1)^* + (B^1)^*]\vec{f} = 0, \quad (21a)$$

$$[\alpha^*(A^2)^* + (B^2)^*]\vec{f} = 0, \quad (21b)$$

which can be regarded as $4N - M_1 - M_2$ equations for $\vec{f}$. For $M_1 + M_2 > 3N$, there are less equations than variables, and thus there always exists a solution for each α , i.e. for each $|e\rangle$, which proves (i). For $M_1 + M_2 \leq 3N$ there exists a nontrivial solution iff the matrix $M(\alpha, \alpha^*)$ composed of $\alpha(A^1)^* + (B^1)^*$ and $\alpha(A^2)^* + (B^2)^*$ has rank smaller than N , which is equivalent to the statement of the lemma. $\square$

Let us now analyze the case in which $M_1 + M_2 = 3N$. Here, we have that the conditions of Lemma 11 are fulfilled

iff $\det[M(\alpha, \alpha^*)] = 0$ for some α . This determinant will be a polynomial $P_{2N-M_1, 2N-M_2}(\alpha, \alpha^*)$ of degree $2N - M_1$ in α and of degree $2N - M_2$ in α^* . Thus, the existence of product vectors $|e, f\rangle \in H_1$ such that $|e^*, f\rangle \in H_2$ is directly related to the existence of roots of that polynomial. For $M_1 + M_2 < 3N$ we have to impose that several determinants containing N rows of $M(\alpha, \alpha^*)$ vanish; again, those conditions are equivalent to imposing that several polynomials in α and α^* have common roots.

Note that for complex polynomials there is no theorem which allows to know how many (if any) roots exist. For example, the equation $\alpha^*\alpha + 1$ has no roots, whereas $\alpha^2 - (\alpha^*)^2 = 0$ has infinitely many. However, in a generic case, given a polynomial $P(\alpha, \alpha^*)$ one can find a polynomial $Q(\alpha)$ of higher degree in α (say K) such that the roots of P are also roots of Q . Since we know that Q has at most K solutions, it means that P can have at most K solutions as well. For example, if we have $P(\alpha, \alpha^*) = \alpha^2 - \alpha^* = 0$, we can complex conjugate this equation and obtain $P(\alpha, \alpha^*)^* = (\alpha^*)^2 - \alpha = 0$, which, upon substituting $\alpha^* = \alpha^2$ we obtain $Q(\alpha) = \alpha^4 - \alpha = 0$. This equation has four solutions $(0, 1, e^{i2\pi/3}, e^{i2\pi/3})$ which are exactly the roots of P . Note that we have been able to reduce the original equation to one containing α only given the fact that the $P^* \neq P$. It is clear that the polynomials fulfilling this condition are dense in the ring of all polynomials, and this is the reason why we say that in the generic case one can find $Q(\alpha)$.

In summary, in this Section we have shown that if there is a product vector in $K(\rho)$ then we can find another operator ρ_s supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^{N-1}$ with the same separability properties as ρ . In order to check whether we can have such product vectors, we have shown that if the dimension of a subspace [e.g., $K(\rho)$] is greater or equal to N , then we can always find product vectors in it. On the other hand, if there is a product vector $|e, f\rangle \in R(\rho)$ with $|e^*, f\rangle \in R(\rho^{T_A})$, then one can decrease the rank of ρ , ρ^{T_A} or both. This is always possible if the ranks of ρ and ρ^{T_A} are sufficiently large. Otherwise, one has to find roots of polynomials. We have also shown that if there is a finite, sufficiently small number of product vectors fulfilling this condition, then we automatically have a necessary and sufficient condition for separability.

IV. RESULTS

This section contains the main results of the paper concerning separability of a density operator supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$. We have divided them in four subsections. The first three deal with different situations depending on the rank of ρ . Actually, we just have to consider the cases in which $r(\rho) \geq N$ as the following lemma states:

Lemma 12: If ρ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ then $r(\rho) \geq N$.

Proof: Let us assume that $r(\rho) < N$. Then $K(\rho)$ has dimension larger than N , and according to Lemma 10 it contains a product vector. Using Lemma 7 we can find an operator $\tilde{\rho}_1$ supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^{N-1}$ and with $r(\tilde{\rho}_1) < N - 1$. Again, $K(\tilde{\rho}_1)$ has dimension larger than $N - 1$, contains a product vector, and we can find an operator $\tilde{\rho}_2$ supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^{N-2}$ and with $r(\tilde{\rho}_2) < N - 2$. We can proceed in the same way until we have an operator $\tilde{\rho}_{N-1}$ supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^1$ and with $r(\tilde{\rho}_2) < 1$, which is impossible. $\square$

The first subsection shows that if $r(\rho) = N$ then ρ is separable. From that follows that bound entangled states have rank larger than N . The second subsection deals with operators ρ such that $r(\rho) + r(\rho^{TA}) \leq 3N$. It is shown that in the generic case and for $N \leq 10$ one can perform a constructive separability check. The third subsection shows that given a density operator, one can always subtract vectors until the condition $r(\rho) + r(\rho^{TA}) \leq 3N$ is obtained. In the fourth one, we show that if $\rho = \rho^{TA}$ then ρ is separable. We also show that if ρ and ρ^{TA} are “sufficiently close” then ρ is also separable.

A. $\text{rank}(\rho) = N$

Theorem 1: If ρ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ and $r(\rho) = N$ then ρ is separable.

Proof: We use induction. For $N = 1$ the statement is true. Let us assume that it is true for $N - 1$. We take now ρ supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$, with $r(\rho) = N$. Then $K(\rho)$ has dimension N , and according to Lemma 10 it contains a product vector $|e, f\rangle$. Using Lemma 7 we have that ρ is separable iff $\tilde{\rho}$ is separable. But $\tilde{\rho}$ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^{N-1}$ and has rank $N - 1$, and therefore it is separable by assumption. $\square$

Corollary 3a: If ρ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ and $r(\rho) = N$, then ρ can be written as a convex sum of projectors on N product vectors.

Proof: Just given by the construction of the Proof of Theorem 1.

Corollary 3b: If ρ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ and $r(\rho) = N$ then $r(\rho^{TA}) = N$.

Proof: This is a direct application of the previous corollary and Lemma 12.

Corollary 3c: If ρ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$ and is not separable, then $r(\rho) > N$.

Proof: Direct application of Lemma 12 and Theorem 1.

B. $\text{rank}(\rho) + \text{rank}(\rho^{TA}) \leq 3N$

We assume that $r(\rho), r(\rho^{TA}) > N$. We can use Lemma 11 with $H_1 = R(\rho)$ and $H_2 = R(\rho^{TA})$ to determine the conditions under which there exist product vectors that can be subtracted from ρ . The problem reduces to finding

the roots of a polynomial in α and α^* . As explained in Section III, in the generic case these roots are also roots of another polynomial in α . If the corresponding projectors P_i are linearly independent [which imposes that the number of such product vectors be smaller than the minimum of $r(\rho)^2$ and $r(\rho^{TA})^2$], then Lemma 11 provides us with a necessary and sufficient condition for separability. We will illustrate this with the case $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$ in the following section.

Let us now show that if $N \leq 10$ then for a generic ρ we can always find less than the minimum of $r(\rho)^2$ and $r(\rho^{TA})^2$ product vectors $|e, f\rangle \in R(\rho)$ and with $|e^*, f\rangle \in R(\rho)$. Without loss of generality we can take $k(\rho) = X \geq k(\rho^{TA}) = Y$ (otherwise we can substitute $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha^*$ in what follows). We also assume that there are no product vectors in $K(\rho)$ since otherwise we can trivially reduce the problem to $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^{N-1}$ decreasing the ranks of ρ and ρ^{TA} via Lemma 7. We therefore have $N > Y \geq X > 0$ and $X + Y \geq N$. Let us analyze separately the cases: (i) $X + Y = N$ and; (ii) $X + Y > N$. If $X + Y = N$ we have $0 < X \leq [N/2]$, where $[W]$ denotes the integer part of W . According to Lemma 11, the problem reduces to finding roots of a polynomial of degree X in α and Y in α^* . In Appendix A we give a procedure to find those roots, which states that the number of roots (for a generic case) will not exceed $2^{X-1}[N^2 + (N - X)^2 - X(N - X)]$. This number should be smaller or equal to $(N + X)^2$. One can check that for $N \leq 10$ this condition is always fulfilled. (ii) If $X + Y > N$ then we have $[(N + 1)/2] \leq Y < N$. According to Lemma 11 there will be two (or more) polynomial equations of degree $N - Y$ in α and Y in α^* . In Appendix B we show that in that case the number of roots cannot exceed $2^{N-Y}Y$. This number should be smaller or equal to $(2N - Y)^2$, which is always the case for $N \leq 10$.

Finally, using the results of the previous subsection we can ensure that if $r(\rho) = r(\rho^{TA}) = N + 1$ then either the polynomials of Lemma 11 have exactly $N + 1$ solutions, in which case ρ is separable and expresable in terms of $N + 1$ product vectors, or it has none and then ρ is bound entangled. This is so because if one can subtract one product vector, then one recovers the situation of Corollary 3a.

C. $\text{rank}(\rho) + \text{rank}(\rho^{TA}) > 3N$

We can use Lemma 11 with $H_1 = R(\rho)$ and $H_2 = R(\rho^{TA})$ to show that there always exist product vectors that can be subtracted from ρ . We can do that until we reach $r(\rho) + r(\rho^{TA}) \leq 3N$. In that case, we can use the criterion given in the previous subsection to find out if the remaining operator is separable. Thus, this procedure gives us a constructive sufficient criterion for separability.

D. Invariance under partial transposition: $\rho = \rho^T$

Theorem 2: If $\rho = \rho^{TA}$ then ρ is separable.

Proof: We prove it by induction. First, if ρ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^1$ then it is obviously true. Now, let us assume that it is valid if ρ is supported on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^{N-1}$ and let us prove that then it is also valid if it is on $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^N$. According to Lemma 12, we just have to consider two cases: (i) $r(\rho) = N$: Using Theorem 1 we have that ρ is separable. (ii) $r(\rho) > N$: according to Corollary 2 there is a product vector $|e_r, g\rangle$ with $|e_r\rangle = |e_r^*\rangle$. Using Corollary 1 we can use this product vector to reduce the rank of ρ . But since $|e_r, g\rangle = |e_r^*, g\rangle$ we have that the resulting operator is also equal to its partial transpose. We can proceed in this way until $r(\rho) = N$, in which case we use Theorem 1 to show that ρ is separable. $\square$

Note that we could have chosen a different basis for the partial transposition. Moreover, since the property of separability is independent of invertible local transformations A acting on $\mathcal{C}^2$, we have the following

Corollary 4: If $[(A \otimes I)\rho(A \otimes I)^\dagger]^{TA} = (A \otimes I)\rho(A \otimes I)^\dagger$, for some non singular operator A , then ρ is separable.

Theorem 2 suggests that if ρ is not very different from ρ^{T^2} , then it should also be separable. Indeed, one can construct a powerful sufficient separability condition based on that theorem. For that we have to introduce some definitions. In $2 \times N$ we can always write ρ as

$$\rho = \frac{\rho + \rho^{TA}}{2} + \frac{\rho - \rho^{TA}}{2} \equiv \rho_s + \sigma_y^A \otimes B, \quad (22)$$

Here $2\rho_s = \rho + \rho^{TA}$, $\sigma_y^A = i(|0\rangle_A \langle 1| - |1\rangle_A \langle 0|)$, and $4B = 4B^\dagger = \text{tr}_A[\sigma_y^A(\rho - \rho^{TA})]$. This operator B can be decomposed as

$$B = \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i |v_i\rangle \langle v_i|. \quad (23)$$

In particular, one of such is the spectral decomposition. Given one of such decomposition $\{\lambda_i, |v_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^K$ and a set of real numbers $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^K$ we define the operator

$$C(a, \lambda, v) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^K |\lambda_i| (a_i^2 |0\rangle \langle 0| + a_i^{-2} |1\rangle \langle 1|) \otimes |v_i\rangle \langle v_i|, \quad (24)$$

which is obviously positive. We have:

Theorem 3: Given a decomposition of B $\{\lambda_i, |v_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^K$ and a set of real numbers $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^K$, if $\|C^{1/2}(a, \lambda, v)\rho_s^{-1/2}\|^2 \leq 1$, then ρ is separable.

Proof: We define $\tilde{\rho}_s = \rho_s - C(a, \lambda, v) = \tilde{\rho}_s^{TA} \geq 0$ according to Lemma 1. Using Theorem 2 we have that $\tilde{\rho}_s$ is separable. Let $|w_i\rangle = a_i |0\rangle - i a_i^{-1} \text{sign}(\lambda_i) |1\rangle$. Then, it is easy to check that

$$\rho = \tilde{\rho}_s + \sum_{i=1}^K |\lambda_i| |w_i, v_i\rangle \langle w_i, v_i|. \quad (25)$$

which shows that ρ is separable. $\square$

Thus, we can show that a density operator is separable if we can find a decomposition of B and a set of real numbers that fulfill certain conditions. In particular we can take the spectral decomposition of B and $a_i = 1$. Using the fact that $\|AB\| \leq \|A\| \|B\|$ one can easily prove the following:

Corollary 5: If $\rho + \rho^{TA}$ is of full range and $\|(\rho + \rho^{TA})^{-1}\| \|\rho - \rho^{TA}\| \leq 1$, then ρ is separable. This corollary implies that if ρ is full range and is very close to ρ^{TA} then it is separable.

Finally, let us mention that we have taken here all partial transposes with respect to the first system. One may wonder whether if ρ is invariant under partial transposition with respect to the second system, then Theorem 2 still holds. Actually, this is not the case. A counterexample can be found in Ref. [8], by simply noting that the bound entangled state given there is equal to its partial transpose if we take that in a different basis.

V. EXAMPLE: $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$

As an illustration of the methods developed in the previous sections to deal with separability when one has low rank density operators, here we will show how one can apply them in the case of $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^4$. We will assume that: (i) ρ has no product vector in its kernel since otherwise using Lemma 7 we can reduce the problem to $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^3$ and there we know that ρ is separable; (ii) $r(\rho), r(\rho^{TA}) > 4$ since otherwise using Theorem 1 we know that ρ is separable; (iii) $r(\rho) + r(\rho^{TA}) \leq 12$ since in that case we can use our separability criterion. This section is divided into 3 parts:

- $r(\rho) = r(\rho^{TA}) = 5$
- $r(\rho) + r(\rho^{TA}) \leq 12$ and $r(\rho) \neq r(\rho^{TA})$.
- $r(\rho) = r(\rho^{TA}) = 6$

As before, we will denote by $\{|\Psi_i^1\rangle, i = 1 \dots k(\rho)\}$ and $\{|\Psi_i^2\rangle, i = 1 \dots k(\rho^{TA})\}$ a basis in $K(\rho)$ and $K(\rho^{TA})$, respectively. We will use the fact that, according to Lemma 11, there exists a product vector $|e, f\rangle \in R(\rho)$ and $|e^*, f\rangle \in R(\rho^{TA})$ iff we can find an α such that there are at most 3 linearly independent vectors among $\{\alpha \langle \Psi_{i_1}^1 | 0 \rangle + \langle \Psi_{i_1}^1 | 1 \rangle, \alpha^* \langle \Psi_{i_2}^2 | 0 \rangle + \langle \Psi_{i_2}^2 | 1 \rangle\}$.

A. $\text{rank}(\rho) = \text{rank}(\rho^{TA}) = 5$

Each of the two kernels has dimension 3 and therefore, according to Lemma 11, in order to find subtractable product vectors we have to solve $M(\alpha, \alpha^*) \vec{f} = 0$, where

$$M(\alpha, \alpha^*) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \langle \Psi_1^1 | 0 \rangle + \langle \Psi_1^1 | 1 \rangle \\ \alpha \langle \Psi_2^1 | 0 \rangle + \langle \Psi_2^1 | 1 \rangle \\ \alpha \langle \Psi_3^1 | 0 \rangle + \langle \Psi_3^1 | 1 \rangle \\ \alpha^* \langle \Psi_1^2 | 0 \rangle + \langle \Psi_1^2 | 1 \rangle \\ \alpha^* \langle \Psi_2^2 | 0 \rangle + \langle \Psi_2^2 | 1 \rangle \\ \alpha^* \langle \Psi_3^2 | 0 \rangle + \langle \Psi_3^2 | 1 \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

is a 6×4 matrix. Using Lemma 9 we know that the last three rows in M are linearly independent. Thus, this equation has non trivial solutions iff

$$\det_1(\alpha, \alpha^*) = \det[M_1(\alpha, \alpha^*)] = 0 \quad (27a)$$

$$\det_2(\alpha, \alpha^*) = \det[M_2(\alpha, \alpha^*)] = 0 \quad (27b)$$

$$\det_3(\alpha, \alpha^*) = \det[M_3(\alpha, \alpha^*)] = 0, \quad (27c)$$

where $M_{1,2,3}$ are 4×4 matrices formed by the last three rows of M and the 1-st, 2-nd, and 3-rd rows, respectively. Note that $\det_1$, $\det_2$ and $\det_3$ are polynomials linear in α and cubic in α^* . Thus, we can write them as

$$\det_1 = \alpha P_3^1(\alpha^*) + P_3^0(\alpha^*) = 0 \quad (28a)$$

$$\det_2 = \alpha \tilde{P}_3^1(\alpha^*) + \tilde{P}_3^0(\alpha^*) = 0 \quad (28b)$$

$$\det_3 = \alpha \hat{P}_3^1(\alpha^*) + \hat{P}_3^0(\alpha^*) = 0, \quad (28c)$$

where the subscripts denote the degree of the polynomials. In order to solve this equation we treat α and α^* as two independent variables. Multiplying Eq. (28a) by $\tilde{P}_3^1(\alpha^*)$, Eq. (28b) by $P_3^1(\alpha^*)$ and subtracting them we find an polynomial equation for α^* of degree 6. Doing the same thing but with Eq. (28c) instead of Eq. (28b) gives another polynomial equation for α^* of 6th degree. Subtracting these two polynomials we obtain a polynomial of degree 5. Thus, there are at most 5 solutions (i.e. 5 product vectors, as stated in Section IV B). Note that the solutions have still to fulfill all Eq. (28). Note also that if we know α we can calculate the kernel of the matrix A for this particular value and find so the corresponding $|f\rangle$.

B. $r(\rho) + r(\rho^{TA}) \leq 12$ where $r(\rho) \neq r(\rho^{TA})$

We are going to divide this part itself into:

- $r(\rho) = 6$ and $r(\rho^{TA}) = 5$ or $r(\rho) = 5$ and $r(\rho^{TA}) = 6$,
- $r(\rho) = 7$ and $r(\rho^{TA}) = 5$ or $r(\rho) = 5$ and $r(\rho^{TA}) = 7$.

Let us begin with the case where $r(\rho) = 6$ and $r(\rho^{TA}) = 5$. Then the dimension of the kernel of ρ is 2 and the one of the kernel of ρ^{TA} is 3. Thus we can write the equations in the same way as in the previous case, but there are only two of them. We have

$$\det_1 = \det[M_1(\alpha, \alpha^*)] = 0 \quad (29a)$$

$$\det_2 = \det[M_2(\alpha, \alpha^*)] = 0, \quad (29b)$$

where M_1 and M_2 are the same matrices as above. Thus the way of calculating the α 's is exactly the same as before, obtaining at most 6 solutions for α^* . On the other hand it is clear that the same can be done in the case where $r(\rho) = 5$ and $r(\rho^{TA}) = 6$.

Now we consider the case $r(\rho) = 7$ and $r(\rho^{TA}) = 5$. Here we have only one equation that has to be fulfilled. We find

$$\det_1 = \det[M_1(\alpha, \alpha^*)] = 0, \quad (30)$$

which leads to

$$0 = \alpha P_3^1(\alpha^*) + P_3^0(\alpha^*) \quad (31a)$$

$$= (\alpha^*)^3 Q_1^3(\alpha) + (\alpha^*)^2 Q_1^2(\alpha) + \alpha^* Q_1^1(\alpha) + Q_1^0(\alpha) \quad (31b)$$

Taking the complex conjugate of Eq. (31a) we have:

$$\alpha^* \bar{P}_3^1(\alpha) + \bar{P}_3^0(\alpha) = 0, \quad (32)$$

where $\bar{P}$ is the same polynomial as P but with the coefficients complex conjugated. As explained in the Appendix we are using now Eq. (32) to transform the polynomial in Eq. (31a) in one depending only on α . That is, we multiply Eq. (31b) by $\bar{P}_3^1(\alpha)$ and Eq. (32) by $Q_1^3(\alpha)$ and subtract them. We do the same two more times and end up with a polynomial of 10-th degree in α . For the different values of α we can now calculate the kernel of the matrix M and obtain $|f\rangle$. Thus we have all the product vectors $|e, f\rangle$ fulfilling $|e, f\rangle \in R(\rho)$ and $|e^*, f\rangle \in R(\rho^{TA})$.

C. $\text{rank}(\rho) = \text{rank}(\rho^{TA}) = 6$

Here we have two vectors in both, the kernel of ρ and the one of ρ^{TA} . Thus the equation that has to be fulfilled is

$$0 = \det(M(\alpha, \alpha^*)) = \alpha^2 P_2^2(\alpha^*) + \alpha P_2^1(\alpha^*) + P_2^0(\alpha^*) \quad (33a)$$

$$= (\alpha^*)^2 Q_2^2(\alpha) + \alpha^* Q_2^1(\alpha) + Q_2^0(\alpha). \quad (33b)$$

Again, we take the complex conjugate of Eq. (33a) and deal with the following two equations:

$$(\alpha^*)^2 Q_2^2(\alpha) + \alpha^* Q_2^1(\alpha) + Q_2^0(\alpha) = 0 \quad (34a)$$

$$(\alpha^*)^2 \bar{Q}_2^2(\alpha) + \alpha^* \bar{Q}_2^1(\alpha) + \bar{Q}_2^0(\alpha) = 0. \quad (34b)$$

First, we multiply Eq. (34a) by $\bar{Q}_2^2(\alpha)$, Eq. (34b) by $Q_2^2(\alpha)$ and subtract them. Then we multiply Eq. (34a) by $\bar{Q}_2^0(\alpha)$, Eq. (34b) by $Q_2^0(\alpha)$ and subtract them and divide the resulting polynomial by α^* . Thus we find

$$\alpha^* [Q_2^1(\alpha) \bar{Q}_2^2(\alpha) - Q_2^2(\alpha) \bar{Q}_2^1(\alpha)] + Q_2^0(\alpha) \bar{Q}_2^2(\alpha) - \bar{Q}_2^0(\alpha) Q_2^2(\alpha) = 0 \quad (35a)$$

$$\alpha^* [Q_2^2(\alpha) \bar{Q}_2^0(\alpha) - \bar{Q}_2^2(\alpha) Q_2^0(\alpha)] + Q_2^1(\alpha) \bar{Q}_2^0(\alpha) - Q_2^0(\alpha) \bar{Q}_2^1(\alpha) = 0. \quad (35b)$$

Now we multiply Eq. (35a) by $[Q_2^2(\alpha)\bar{Q}_2^0(\alpha) - Q_2^2(\alpha)Q_2^0(\alpha)]$, Eq. (35b) by $[Q_2^1(\alpha)\bar{Q}_2^2(\alpha) - Q_2^2(\alpha)\bar{Q}_2^1(\alpha)]$ and subtract them again and end up with a polynomial of degree 8 in α . Note that this means that it may not be possible to write the density operator as a convex sum of 6 product vectors. In fact, we have confirmed that and found examples in which one needs 8 product vectors.

APPENDIX: REDUCTION OF ONE POLYNOMIAL

In this appendix we show that given a generic polynomial $P_{X,Y}(\alpha, \alpha^*)$ of degree X and Y in α and α^* respectively, there are at most $2^{X-1}[X + Y(Y - X + 1)]$ roots, where without loss of generality we have assumed $Y \geq X$. The idea is to find another polynomial $Q(\alpha)$ of degree $2^{X-1}[X + Y(Y - X + 1)]$ such that all the roots of P are also roots of Q . Since Q has at most $2^{X-1}[X + Y(Y - X + 1)]$ roots, this will prove our statement.

We start by writing the equation $P = 0$ as

$$0 = P_{X,Y}(\alpha, \alpha^*) = \sum_{k=0}^X \alpha^k P_Y^k(\alpha^*) \quad (\text{A1a})$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^Y (\alpha^*)^k Q_X^k(\alpha), \quad (\text{A1b})$$

where P_Y^k and Q_X^k denote polynomials of degree Y and X , respectively. We complex conjugate the last line in this equation and obtain

$$0 = \sum_{k=0}^Y \alpha^k \bar{Q}_X^k(\alpha^*), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\bar{Q}$ is the same polynomial as Q but with the coefficients complex conjugated. From now on we treat α and $\beta \equiv \alpha^*$ as two independent variables. Thus, we can write Eqs. (A1a) and (A2) as

$$\sum_{k=0}^X \alpha^k P_Y^k(\beta) = 0 \quad (\text{A3a})$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^Y \alpha^k \bar{Q}_X^k(\beta) = 0. \quad (\text{A3b})$$

We proceed now in two steps:

(1) If $Y \neq X$ we use Eq. (A3a) to transform Eq. (A3b) to one of the form

$$\sum_{k=0}^X \alpha^k R_Z^k(\beta) = 0, \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $Z = X + Y(Y - X)$. This can be done in the following way. First we multiply Eq. (A3a) by $\alpha^{Y-X}\bar{Q}_X^Y(\beta)$,

Eq. (A3b) by $P_Y^X(\beta)$, and subtract them. In this way we obtain a polynomial equation of degree $Y - 1$ in α and $Y + X$ in β . We use again Eq. (A3a) to transform this one to a polynomial equation of degree $Y - 2$ in α . We proceed in the same way until we reach Eq. (A4). Note that if $Y = X$ then we have automatically Eq. (A4) with $Z = X$.

(2) First, we multiply Eq. (A3a) by $R_Z^X(\beta)$, Eq. (A4) by $P_Y^X(\beta)$ and subtract them. In parallel, we multiply Eq. (A3a) by $R_Z^0(\beta)$, Eq. (A4) by $P_Y^0(\beta)$, subtract them, and divide by α the result. In this way, we obtain two polynomial equations of degree $X - 1$ in α and $Y + Z$ in β . We can do the same thing with these two, and proceed in the same vein until we reach a polynomial equation of the form $\bar{Q}(\beta) = 0$ (i.e. $Q(\alpha) = 0$) of degree $2^{(X-1)}(Z + Y)$. All the roots of the original polynomial must be roots of Q .

APPENDIX B: REDUCTION OF TWO POLYNOMIALS

Following a similar procedure as in the previous appendix, we show here that given two generic polynomials $P_{X,Y}$ and $\tilde{P}_{X,Y}$ of degree X and Y in α and α^* respectively, there are at most $2^X Y$ common roots, where without loss of generality we have assumed $Y \geq X$. Treating α and $\beta \equiv \alpha^*$ as independent variables, if we write

$$0 = P_{X,Y}(\alpha, \alpha^*) = \sum_{k=0}^X \alpha^k P_Y^k(\beta), \quad (\text{B1a})$$

$$0 = \tilde{P}_{X,Y}(\alpha, \alpha^*) = \sum_{k=0}^X \alpha^k \tilde{P}_Y^k(\beta), \quad (\text{B1b})$$

$$(\text{B1c})$$

we can use the same procedure presented in step (2) in the previous appendix to obtain a polynomial equation $Q(\alpha)$ of degree $2^X Y$.

We emphasize that if one has more polynomials, one can further decrease the degree of $Q(\alpha)$. An example is shown in Section V, when the ranks of ρ and ρ^{T_A} equal 5.

This work has been supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB 407) and Schwerpunkt "Quanteninformationsverarbeitung", the Österreichischer Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung (SFB P11), the European TMR network ERB-FMRX-CT96-0087, and the Institute for Quantum Information GmbH. J. I. C. thanks the University of Hannover for hospitality. We thank, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera and G. Vidal for discussions.

- [1] R. F. Werner Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [2] See, for example, A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: concepts and methods*, (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1993).
- [3] See, for example, D. P. DiVincenzo, Science **270**, 255 (1995).
- [4] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and M. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **230**, 377 (1996).
- [5] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett **77**, 1413 (1996).
- [6] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
- [7] E. Stromer, Acta Math. **110**, 233 (1963); S. L. Woronowicz, Rep. Math. Phys. **10**, 165 (1976).
- [8] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333 (1997); M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5239 (1998).
- [9] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3081 (1999); D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, quant-ph/9908070; B. Terhal, quant-ph/9810091; C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, Ch. A. Fuchs, T. Mor, E. Rains, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, W. K. Wootters, quant-ph/9804053.
- [10] R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, quant-ph/9811004.
- [11] M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206 (1999).
- [12] K. Życzkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 883 (1998); G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 141 (1999); S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, R. Jozsa, N. Linden, S. Popescu, R. Schack, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1054 (1999).
- [13] P. Horodecki, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, A. V. Thapliyal, quant-ph/9910122.
- [14] W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** 3562 (1999).
- [15] M. Lewenstein and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2261 (1998); A. Sanpera, R. Tarrach, and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 826 (1998), G. Vidal, PhD Thesis, Universitat de Barcelona (1999).